

## **Remarks**

Claims 17-69 are cancelled and claims 1 and 11 are amended herein leaving claims 1-16 pending in the application.

Applicant acknowledges the March 3, 2008 telephone conversation with the Examiner and herein confirms the election without traverse of the invention of Group I, claims 1-16 and 29-54.

As claim 51 has been cancelled, the objection to the drawings relating to this claim is requested to be withdrawn as moot.

The previously pending claims stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,367,139, hereafter '139) or as obvious in view of '139 in various combinations with Koinuma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,569,502, hereafter '502), Shinriki et al. (WO 02/15243, hereafter the corresponding English version of '243, U.S. Patent No. 6,806,211, '211), 'T Hoen (U.S. Patent No. 4,518,889, hereafter '889), Oehrlein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,798,016, hereafter '016), Okase (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,989, hereafter '989), and/or Campbell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,461,436, hereafter '436). Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections in view of the amendments to the claims and remarks herein for at least the reason that the cited references, either alone or to the extent they can be properly combined, do not teach all the elements of the pending claims.

For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in pertinent part, a piezoelectric liner coupled to the at least one surface of the chamber, and

that an acoustic wave driver is deployed on the piezoelectric liner. The cited references do not teach this feature in the context of the chamber as claimed.

The Examiner has recognized that '139 reference fails to describe interior piezoelectric liners but improperly relies on '502 for this limitation because '139 and '502 contradict their combination. The '139 reference addresses the removal of contamination during plasma processes while the '502 reference describes processes for depositing film. The '139 reference describes the use of mechanical agitation to remove particles during the plasma process while the '502 reference describes the application of ultrasonic oscillation to a substrate during film deposition. A person of ordinary skill in the art of semiconductor processing can only be lead to believe that utilizing the teachings of the '502 reference will not remove contaminates, but would rather deposit contaminates. Therefore, that same person, reviewing the '139 reference with an aim toward removing contaminates could not rely on the teachings of the '502 reference and as such there combination is improper. For at least the reason, that combining these references improper, the cited references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 1 and claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-16 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons given above regarding claim 1.

Applicant requests allowance of claims 1-16 in the Examiner's next action. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (509) 624-4276 between the hours of 8:00a.m. and 5:00p.m. (PDT).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/30/08

By: 

Robert O. Hyta  
Reg. No. 46791